(a) Investigation and Technical Plan; and

(b) Management and Cost Plan as described in 1872.705–2. Investigators shall be required to identify and discuss risk factors and issues throughout the proposal where they are relevant, and describe their approach to managing these risks.

[65 FR 82297, Dec. 28, 2000, as amended at 67 FR 61520, Oct. 1, 2002]

Subpart 1872.4—Evaluation of Proposals

1872.401 General.

(a) The evaluation process considers the aspects of each proposal by the following progressive sorting:

(1) A review resulting in a categorization is performed by using one of the methods or combination of the methods outlined in 1872.403. The purpose of this initial review is to determine the scientific and/or technological merit of the proposals in the context of the AO objectives.

(2) Those proposals which are considered to have the greatest scientific or technological merit are then reviewed in detail for the engineering, management, and cost aspects, usually by the project office at the installation responsible for the project.

(3) Final reviews are performed by the program office and the steering committee and are aimed at developing a group of investigations which represent an integrated payload or a well-balanced program of investigation which has the best possibility for meeting the AO's objectives within programmatic constraints.

(b) The importance of considering the interrelationship of the several aspects of the proposals to be reviewed in the process and the need for carefully planning their treatment should not be overlooked. An evaluation plan should be developed before issuance of the AO. It should cover the recommended staffing for any subcommittee or contractor support, review guidelines as well as the procedural flow and schedule of the evaluation. While not mandatory, such a plan should be considered for each AO. A fuller discussion of the evaluation and selection process is included in the following sections of this subpart.

1872.402 Criteria for evaluation.

(a) Each AO must indicate those criteria which the evaluators will apply in evaluating a proposal. The relative importance of each criterion must also be stated. This information will allow investigators to make informed judgments in formulating proposals that best meet the stated objectives.

(b) Following is a list of general evaluation criteria appropriate for inclusion in most AOs:

(1) The scientific, applications, and/or technological merit of the investigation.

(2) The relevance of the proposed investigation to the AO's stated scientific, applications, and/or technological objectives.

(3) The competence and experience of the investigator and any investigative team.

(4) Adequacy of whatever apparatus may be proposed with particular regard to its ability to supply the data needed for the investigation.

(5) The reputation and interest of the investigator's institution, as measured by the willingness of the institution to provide the support necessary to ensure that the investigation can be completed satisfactorily.

(6) Cost and management aspects will be considered in all selections.

(7) The proposed approach to managing risk (*e.g.*, level of technology maturity being applied or developed, technical complexity, performance specifications and tolerances, delivery schedule, etc.).

(8) Other or additional criteria may be used, but the evaluation criteria must be germane to the accomplishment of the stated objectives.

(c) Once the AO is issued, it is essential that the evaluation criteria be applied in a uniform manner. If it becomes apparent, before the date set for receipt of proposals, that the criteria or their relative importance should be changed, the AO will be amended, and all known recipients will be informed of the change and given an adequate opportunity to consider it in submission of their proposals. Evaluation criteria and/or their relative importance

will not be changed after the date set for receipt of proposals.

[62 FR 4472, Jan. 30, 1997, as amended at 67 FR 61520 Oct. 1, 2002]

1872.403 Methods of evaluation.

Alternative methods are available to initiate the evaluation of proposals received in response to an AO. These are referred to as the Advisory Subcommittee Evaluation Process, the Contractor Evaluation Process, and the Government Evaluation Process. In all processes, a subcommittee of the appropriate Program Office Steering Committee will be formed to categorize the proposals. Following categorization, those proposals still in consideration will be processed to the selection official.

1872.403–1 Advisory subcommittee evaluation process.

(a) Evaluation of scientific and/or technological merit of proposed investigations is the responsibility of an advisory subcommittee of the Steering Committee. The subcommittee constitutes a peer group qualified to judge the scientific and technological aspects of all investigation proposals. One or more subcommittees may be established depending on the breadth of the technical or scientific disciplines inherent in the AO's objectives. Each subcommittee represents a discipline or grouping of closely related disciplines. To maximize the quality of the subcommittee evaluation and categorization, the following conditions of selection and appointment should be considered.

(1) The subcommittee normally should be established on an ad hoc basis.

(2) Qualifications and acknowledgment of the professional abilities of the subcommittee members are of primary importance. Institutional affiliations are not sufficient qualifications.

(3) The executive secretary of the subcommittee must be a full-time NASA employee.

(4) Subcommittee members should normally be appointed as early as possible and prior to receipt of proposals.

(5) Care must be taken to avoid conflicts of interest. These include financial interests, institutional affiliations, professional biases and associations, as well as familiar relationships. Conflicts could further occur as a result of imbalance between Government and non-Government appointees or membership from institutions representing a singular school of thought in discipline areas involving competitive theories in approach to an investigation.

(6) The subcommittee should convene as a group in closed sessions for proposal evaluation to protect the proposer's proprietary ideas and to allow frank discussion of the proposer's qualifications and the merit of the proposer's ideas. Lead review responsibility for each proposal may be assigned to members most qualified in the involved discipline. It is important that each proposal be considered by the entire subcommittee.

(b) It may not be possible to select a subcommittee fully satisfying all of the conditions described in paragraph (a) of this section. It is the responsibility of the nominating and appointing officials to make trade-offs, where necessary, among the criteria in paragraph (a) of this section. This latitude permits flexibility in making decisions in accord with circumstances of each application. In so doing, however, it is emphasized that recognized expertise in evaluating dissimilar proposals is essential to the continued workability of the investigation acquisition process.

(c) Candidate subcommittee members should be nominated by the office having responsibility for the evaluation. Nominations should be approved in accordance with NMI 1150.2, ''Establishment, Operation, and Duration of NASA Advisory Committees.'' The notification of appointment should specify the duration of assignment on the subcommittee, provisions concerning conflicts of interest, and arrangements regarding honoraria, per diem, and travel when actually employed.

(d) It is important that members of the subcommittee be formally instructed as to their responsibilities with respect to the investigation acquisition process, even where several or all of the members have served previously. This briefing of subcommittee members should include: